

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
THURSDAY, AUGUST 19, 2004**

BOCC Hearing Room
Public Services Building
1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing of August 19, 2004, was called to order by Chair, Vaughn Lein. The hearing was held at the Public Services Building, BOCC Hearing Room, 1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor, Vancouver, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Vaughn Lein, Chair; Jeff Wriston, Vice Chair; Carey Smith, Jada Rupley, Dick Deleissegues, Lonnie Moss, and Ron Barca.

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Maureen Knutson, Engineering Manager; Cathy Corliss, Consultant, Angelo Eaton & Associates, and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for August 19, 2004

The agenda for August 19, 2004, was approved as distributed.

B. Approval of Minutes of June 24th & July 15, 2004

MOTION was made by Jada Rupley and **Seconded** by Carey Smith to **APPROVE** the Minutes of June 24th and July 15, 2004. **MOTION WAS APPROVED** by unanimous voice vote of all members present.

C. Communications from the Public

None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. AMEND CCC SUBTITLE 40.5 PROCEDURES AS FOLLOWS:

Clark County Department of Community Development has been working to implement the recommendations of the Performance Audit completed by Citygate Associates in December 2000. Among the key issues, the Performance Audit confirmed the need to improve the County's final plat and final site plan processes.

The County's review and approval processes for final plat and final site plans is complex and has resulted in confusion for both the public and private sectors. Because the current processes are a result of many years' of interpretation and reinterpretation of state and local requirements, it has become more and more difficult to ensure consistent application and to train County staff.

In November, 2002, the Department hired a consultant, Angelo Eaton & Associates (AEA) and Larry Epstein, PC, to analyze the existing final plat and final site plan processes and suggest improvements, along with necessary code amendments and staff training. As part of this effort, AEA has been working with county staff and stakeholders to gather opinions, concerns and ideas regarding the final plat and final site plan processes in Clark County. Input from these stakeholder interviews was used to develop processing improvements that addressed the need for timelines for approvals and greater predictability.

This proposed ordinance amends CCC Subtitle 40.5 (Procedures) as follows:

- 40.500.010 (Summary of Procedures and Processes) to identify site plan review as a Type 1 process;
- 40.510 (Type I, II, III and IV Processes) to enable some exceptions from the standard Type I process for final site plan review;
- 40.540.070 (Final Plats) to be consistent with current practice and to allow greater flexibility in the timing of recording of certain covenants, easements, and dedications; and,
- 40.520.040 (Site Plan Review) to add requirements for final site plan.

Staff Contact: Maureen Knutson, (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4064.

LEIN: We will continue on to tonight's public hearing item. Item A is amend Clark County Subtitle 40.5, Procedures. Ms. Knutson, please.

KNUTSON: Good evening. I have with me tonight Catherine Corliss from Angelo, Eaton & Associates who's been the consultant, part of the consultant team that's been working with us on these ordinance changes. As you recall, we came to the Planning Commission work session back in, gosh, it was February now and were asked to bring back some additional information. Some other things transpired. We came back for a second Planning Commission work session last July. And so I'd like to ask how much history or highlighting would you like me to do or can we pick up from the last work session and tell you what has transpired since then? I realize that not everyone was at

both work sessions so I don't want to waste time, but I also don't want to --

LEIN: Is there a need to revisit anything or can we just continue?

BARCA: That's fine.

LEIN: Would you continue, please.

KNUTSON: Okay. Maybe what we can do then is pick up where we left off at the end of the last work session. And in the staff report we did talk about our last visit here and some of the questions that came up and I know that Lonnie had some questions about the final site plan submittal and what needed to be included in that, we have addressed that in the exhibits to make it clear what needs to be included. And I can refer you to those pages in Exhibit B on Page 437. Let's see here.

Okay. Oh, okay, I'm sorry, I'm starting off with a clarification. We've been asked to make a wording change from "may" to "are" and so that's been taken care of here on Page 437 and what we've done is highlighted the underline to show you what changed from the last time to this time. The other thing that we were asked about was whether these changes would apply to binding site plans and indeed they do and we have added some language in there to clarify what is required and that is shown in Exhibit B on Page 439. So there was an addition of in addition to what we would normally require for a final site plan, binding site plans needed to also contain a survey prepared by a licensed land surveyor showing project boundaries with closures, land division lines and then parcel area of lots expressed in square footage, so just some real minor clarifications there. And then the last item was clarification of submittal requirements for the final site plan/final construction plan review, and that was some questions that Lonnie had last time and I inadvertently started out with those instead of going in sequential order. So we've addressed those on Pages 440 and 441.

One of the questions he had asked was did the final site plan with the construction plan give all the needed information and he had a question about whether, you know, what about landscaping and things like that, elevations, and so we have added into here what needs to be included to make it a complete package and we've referenced construction plan requirements are spelled out in each of the various ordinances, whether it be the transportation standards or the stormwater ordinance or the erosion control ordinance. So we've just referenced them here instead of recreating those submittal requirements or criteria in this section. So I think that those were the primary issues.

Oh, and with one addition actually, for a complete construction plan set, and this was left out inadvertently because we don't regulate water and sewer here at the County, they're not our utilities, but for a complete construction plan set you need to have also the water and sewer plan so that you can look for utility conflicts and the contractor needs it to help build the project anyway and so the full plans that actually comes out of the County with those included, but we didn't specifically list them here in this language so we'd like to recommend that we, that may, that be one additional item or two additional items, the water and the sewer utility plans. And that was -- those were really

the only issues that came out of the second work session.

LEIN: Maureen, a question on the one that you added under the final site plan/final construction plan review on Page 440, Item 8, additional information as required by the responsible official, is that something that would typically come out of the pre-app?

KNUTSON: I think it's something that would probably come out of the preliminary.

LEIN: Preliminary.

KNUTSON: The preliminary land use approval that may not be anticipated early enough to identify it in this code, it leaves some room for --

CORLISS: I could -- one of the examples that actually I was chatting with my -- I'm sorry. One of the examples I was talking to Mike Butts about earlier was with town homes for example which aren't a particularly common product, one might need to demonstrate with the -- might actually need to include an elevation that shows frontage for example and the way that the garage doors are treated. We wouldn't want to necessarily require that in every case, but you might as a condition of approval from preliminary need to demonstrate that something in addition over and above what's listed here in final in your construction plan set and that was, we were just thinking about some examples where you might have a, kind of an unusual product that you're addressing or if there were a PUD that had some specific community open space improvements that were being designed or something like that. So that was the only kind, you know, just for something that might be nontypical.

WRISTON: I think the language should be consistent then, should stay consistent with, you know, the preliminary approval or something like that, it's way too open ended for me and I think probably what you were getting at.

LEIN: Yeah.

WRISTON: You know, consistent with preliminary approval or something like that so that there's some standard, but I agree that there are --

MOSS: Or as --

WRISTON: What's that?

MOSS: Yeah, or with as required by conditions of preliminary approval.

WRISTON: Right, something like that. But I agree that's --

LEIN: Any other questions from members of the Commission?

RUPLEY: Maureen, I'd like you to go back to the staff report under "background." In the first paragraph it talks about suggested improvements along with necessary code

amendments and staff training, what kinds of things would you talk about under staff training for this?

KNUTSON: Oh, the reason that we included staff training is that -- well, I guess what I was thinking of initially was that as we change the process of course we'd have to do some staff training to get them familiar with the new ordinance. Staff training is just an issue of making sure that the staff that we do have processing final plats and final site plans because it used to be something that was handled by the planners and it's now being handled by professional staff that is of a technician series rather than an actual planning series, so it's just making sure that they're familiar enough with the planning issues and the land use ordinance so that when they're getting the decision it's -- they can clearly interpret what the conditions are requiring without a lot of assistance of going back to the planners, although they're always there as a resource, I think that's pretty much what we were thinking.

RUPLEY: And how do you do that? Do you have some formal process for that? Because I actually think that's really good, especially in light of some of the earlier discussion tonight that planning of that group is very, very important.

KNUTSON: We actually do. Mike Butts has put together an education program that is open to anybody in the Department, well, probably anyone who wants to go through it. I think it was geared primarily at the customer service staff down in the permit center to make sure that they understood the kinds of permits they were taking in and how they applied to the kind of processes that they were going to be subject to. And so he's broken it down, it's a suite of different little courses I guess you could say, Type I process, Type II process, Type III process, appeal process, a SEPA, shoreline, any number of things that go through his shop and he basically hands it out and you, he's identified the staff that will provide the training and then it's up to the individual employee to contact that person and schedule at mutual convenience to go over that.

And, you know, it includes coming to a public hearing, going through pre-application conference, it's pretty comprehensive. And when Mike did that, Engineering Services followed suit because we decided that, you know, again, we were geared mostly towards the customer service staff but we recognize it's an excellent tool for orienting new employees and it's also a good tool just for anybody to get a broader context within which we're operating. Because we do tend to specialize and it's a little hard to see outside of your area of influence, so if you can understand what's happening upstream and downstream of you, you can do a better job of smoothing the transition.

RUPLEY: Okay. Thanks.

LEIN: This is a question for Lonnie. Normally a land surveyor has to sign their documents when submitted just like an engineer?

MOSS: Correct.

LEIN: Is that something we need to say in terms of signed survey or is that pretty much

mandated by a State law because it's required?

KNUTSON: I think it's pretty much covered under State law. There are standards for surveying.

MOSS: Uh-huh. Yeah, the requirements for surveyors and engineers are explicitly provided for in the WACs what you have to sign and what doesn't have to be signed.

LEIN: Anything for public has to be signed?

MOSS: Well, basically it's a site plan like this that shows a plat would have to be signed, yes. If it constitutes the practice of engineering or land surveying, it has to be.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, be a registered land surveyor.

LEIN: Any other questions on this?

WRISTON: I'd just say on Number 8 again that I think Lonnie's clarification was good that it should be something along the lines of as required or consistent with conditions of, conditions of preliminary approval.

KNUTSON: I did make note of that.

WRISTON: Because there's somewhat -- okay. Well, it's just there's so much discussion during the, you know, but then when you actually get down to the conditions, those are the ones that that's where the rubber meets the road so.

KNUTSON: Well, I guess one question I have is that typically when a proposal goes through a land use approval process, if they can show that they are meeting the code requirements with what they've submitted, a condition is not written, it's only the things that are missing that conditions are written for. So could there be something that was, I don't know, missed that there would be no condition, yet there would still be a code requirement? That's a question I have.

MOSS: Yeah. Yeah, there could be. For example some of the geometric criteria may have been missed in the original submittal, there wouldn't be a condition related to that, but there's still a code requirement to show that information.

WRISTON: It's a or required by code.

KNUTSON: Okay. Or required by code. That would, that would take care of it.

WRISTON: Are you comfortable with that? I just want to make sure that I mean --

MOSS: Or otherwise required by code.

WRISTON: Or otherwise required by code. I mean if there's -- those decisions are very

thick and I just don't want anyone pulling anything out of, anything other than the conditions of approval and not discussion or --

MOSS: Yeah, I don't want to get down to the end and have somebody say I'm a responsible official and I want this and this and this.

WRISTON: Right. Yeah, very specific.

KNUTSON: We can certainly make that change.

WRISTON: Okay. Good. Thank you.

BARCA: That's the rubber meeting the road.

LEIN: Any other comments or questions? If not, entertain a motion.

WRISTON: Ron.

BARCA: I don't know if I'm qualified. Oh, okay, I will. I'd like to make a **MOTION** that we **approve** the changes brought forward and the rest of the staff recommendation for final plat, final site plan process.

WRISTON: **Second.**

LEIN: Further discussion or clarification? Lonnie.

MOSS: Yeah, clarification. You are including the change to Number 8?

BARCA: I believe I said changes and staff report.

WRISTON: He's a little feisty there tonight.

MOSS: Well, these are changes, just clarifying.

LEIN: That would be changes also adding water and sewer plans --

KNUTSON: Yes, please.

LEIN: -- would be added changes?

BARCA: And the part about the rubber meeting the road for the code.

LEIN: Moved and seconded. Any other comments? Could we have roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

DELEISSEGUES: AYE
MOSS: AYE
BARCA: AYE
SMITH: AYE
WRISTON: AYE
RUPLEY: AYE
LEIN: AYE

LEIN: That concludes the public hearing for this evening.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing are filed in Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning. The minutes can also be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP_PCagenda.asp

Vaughn Lein, Chair

Date

Minutes Transcribed By:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter
Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant
SwMIN 08-19-2004